

# NEWS FROM ED MARKEY

**United States Congress**

**Massachusetts Seventh District**

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

**June 15, 2005**

**CONTACT: Tara McGuinness**

**Michal Freedhoff**

**(202) 225-2836**

## **BUSH ADMINISTRATION FAILS ACID TEST ON CHEMICAL SECURITY**

### ***Department of Homeland Security Witness Refuses to Provide Details of "New" Plan***

**Washington, DC** – Representative Edward Markey (D-MA), a senior Member of the Homeland Security Committee, released the following statement in response to today's Homeland Security Committee hearing testimony given by Mr. Robert Stephan, Assistant Secretary for Infrastructure Protection, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, and subsequent questioning by the Congressman:

"The Bush Administration is all talk and no action," said Rep. Markey. "While claiming to abandon its own earlier policy of allowing the chemical industry to regulate itself, today's hearing shows the Bush Administration isn't willing to put its money where its mouth is and commit to any meaningful security upgrades."

During the April 2005 mark-up of the Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act, Rep. Markey offered an amendment that included provisions to strengthen security at chemical plants. The amendment failed on a party-line vote. When the bill reached the Floor, Rep. Markey's language was included as part of the Democratic Substitute, which also failed by a party-line vote. Rep. Markey's chemical security provisions were actively opposed by the American Chemistry Council, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and a coalition of chemical, agricultural and petrochemical companies. During today's hearing, Rep. Markey asked Mr. Stephan questions to determine exactly which aspects of the Markey chemical security proposal the Bush Administration *would* support. The results were largely disappointing.

**Question:** Does the Administration believe that legislation is needed to grant the Department of Homeland Security the regulatory authority it needs?

**Answer: Yes**

**Question:** Would the Administration support legislation that required DHS to evaluate chemical facility security using force-on-force exercises?

**Answer: Not willing to commit**

**Question:** Would the Administration support legislation that required companies to reduce the risk their facilities posed by taking steps to replace toxic chemicals or processes with less dangerous technologies, when it is economically and technologically feasible for them to do so?

**Answer: No.**

**Question:** Would the Administration support having whistleblower protections for anyone who is retaliated against for reporting chemical security flaws that are at least as strong as those provided by Congress in the Sarbanes-Oxley Act to Enron or Worldcom employees who are retaliated against for reporting accounting fraud?

**Answer: Not willing to commit**

“The Bush Administration seems to plan to continue to put the interests of Corporate America ahead of the homeland security interests of ordinary Americans. There are night clubs in New York City that are harder to get into than some of our chemical plants. This is unacceptable, and I will continue to fight to achieve meaningful security upgrades at these facilities. I was hoping that today the Bush Administration would make specific commitments to address the gaping security loopholes at these facilities. Unfortunately, this looks like more of the same empty rhetoric,” Rep. Markey said.

For more information on Representative Markey’s work on homeland security check out:

<http://www.house.gov/markey/>

###